

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 713

EC 301 324

AUTHOR Levine, Esther Zager
TITLE Implementing a Collaborative Consultation Model for Learning Disabled and At-Risk Students in Grade 9.
PUB DATE 23 Mar 92
NOTE 94p.; Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Style; *Consultation Programs; Cooperative Planning; *Educational Cooperation; Grade 9; *High Risk Students; High Schools; *Intervention; *Learning Disabilities; Regular and Special Education Relationship; Special Education Teachers; *Teaching Styles; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

This practicum sought to improve the education of six learning-disabled and five at-risk ninth-grade students in English, science, and social studies classes, by implementing a collaborative consultation model which involved having individual teachers work collaboratively with a resource room teacher. Targeted students were given the O'Brien Learning Channel Reference Test. Collaborating teachers completed the Modified Meyers-Briggs Test to determine their teaching style, analyzed learning styles of target students, completed curriculum-based assessments, prioritized the skills needed by students, conducted strategy intervention teaching, reinforced the strategies, learned about and implemented behavioral interventions, and evaluated student progress. The project resulted in improved teaching and learning through analysis of teaching style and learner needs and creation of strategies to meet those needs. Appendices contain forms and survey results. (Approximately 60 references) (JDD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED347713

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

Implementing a Collaborative Consultation Model
for Learning Disabled and At-Risk Students in Grade 9.

by

Esther Zager Levine

Cluster 44

A Practicum I Report presented to the
Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

1992

Esther Zager
Levine

2

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 301324

FRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: _____

Dr. Robert T.
Alden

Robert T. Alden
Signature of verifier

PRINCIPAL, VALLEY STREAM NORTH H. S.
Title

750 HERMAN AVE., FRANKLIN SQ., NY 11010
Address

2/24/92

Date

This practicum report was submitted by Esther Zager
Levine under the direction of the advisor listed below. It
was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies
and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

3/23/92
Date

Mary W. Staggs, Ed.D.
Signature of Adviser

Adviser:

Dr. Mary W. Staggs

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to my principal, Dr. Robert T. Alden for giving me permission and encouragement to pursue my practicum study. I would also like to thank the teachers, Marc Emmerman, Adrienne Glynn, Rona Kalin Moss and John Mugno who gave unselfishly of their time and expertise to turn this practicum idea into a reality. Special thanks also to Dr. Mary W. Staggs, my practicum adviser, who guided and directed me through the practicum process.

I would like to thank two special people, without whom this practicum would not have been completed. Many thanks to my special friend and colleague, Paul Marino, for his expert guidance in the writing process. Eternal gratitude to my husband, Arthur Saul Levine, without whose help, encouragement and support I could never strive to do the things I do.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Description of Work Setting and Community .	1
Work Setting and Role	4
II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM	6
Problem Description	6
Problem Documentation	8
Causative Analysis	11
Relationship of the Problem to the Literature	12
III ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS	15
Goals and Expectations	15
Expected Outcomes	19
Measurement of Outcomes	20
IV SOLUTION STRATEGY	22
Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions	22
Description of Selected Solution	26
Report of Action Taken	30
V RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	34
Results	34
Student Results	34
Teacher Results	45
Practicum Teacher Results.....	51
Discussion	53
Recommendations	57
Dissemination	60

REFERENCES	61
Appendices	66
A LEARNING CHANNEL PREFERENCE CHECKLIST	68
B SURVEY ON INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS	70
C ATTITUDE TOWARDS CLASSROOM ADAPTIONS SURVEY	72
D INFORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM	74
E SAMPLE CBA FOR READING COMPREHENSION AND VOCABULARY EVALUATION IN GRADE 9	76
F GRAPHIC ORGANIZERS AND OTHER STRATEGIES	78
G INTERVIEWS FOR FINAL EVALUATION	80
H FINAL STUDENT INTERVIEW: PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM PROCEEDURE	83
I FINAL INTERVIEW: CLASSROOM TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROJECT	85

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1: Report of Learning Disabled Students' Grades ..	39
2: Report of At-Risk Students' Grades	44

ABSTRACT

Implementing a Collaborative Consultation Model for Learning Disabled and At-Risk Students in Grade 9. Levine, Esther Zager, 1992. Practicum Report, Nova University, Ed.D Program in Child and Youth Studies. Teacher Collaboration/Consultation in Special Education/Learning Disabled/At-Risk/Secondary Teacher Education/Strategy Intervention/Learning Styles/Teaching Styles/Cooperative Planning/Teacher Training/Multidisciplinary Team

This practicum was undertaken in an effort to improve the education of learning disabled and at-risk ninth grade students in regents level courses. The goal of this collaborative consultation was to implement the Resource Teacher Consultant Model by having individual teachers work collaboratively with a resource room teacher. The project was expected to, and did impact on two groups of students (six learning disabled and five at-risk youngsters) in four different classrooms. Improved teaching and learning was accomplished through analysis of teaching style and learner needs and creation of strategies to meet those needs.

In addition to meeting all of the expected outcomes set forth in the project proposal, several unanticipated results occurred. One, teachers worked as a group (or team) helping and supporting one another, as much as they worked on the one-to-one model. Two, the variety of interventions, some requiring outside personnel, undertaken on behalf of the at-risk youngsters far exceeded what would have been done for these youngsters by any individual teacher. Finally, the benefits to teachers, students and the overall educational process of ninth graders is far reaching and the project results suggest several avenues for future study and work.

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed.D Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do (✓) do not () give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiche, handling, and mailing of the materials.

March 30, 1992
(date)

Esther Zager Levine
(signature)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Work Setting and Community

The setting for the implementation of this collaborative consultation plan is a junior-senior high school in a suburban community. The community has a median income level of \$44,000.00 per household as compared to a median of \$50,000.00 for the county. (As reported in a local business news report, 1991.) There are more than two times as many senior citizens in the community as pre-school children. (1990 Census of Population and Housing). The community is racially homogeneous. In January, 1991, the statistics reported to the governor and legislature of this state in a report of Racial/Ethnic Distribution of Public School Students and Staff, were: 90.1 percent of the student body is white, 5.6 percent Asian, 4.1 percent Hispanic and 0.2 percent black.

The school, which is the setting for the study, houses about 720 students and 75 teachers, counselors and administrators. In 1990 a county information exchange survey reported the overall teacher-student ratio to be 13.7, but in most required academic classes there is a register of between 28 and 30 students. Attendance rate is

95 percent (slightly higher than the mean for a comparison made with a group of 17 neighboring districts) while the drop-out rate is 2.0 (which is also higher than the rate for that same comparison group).

Most of the districts' students follow graduation with some form of higher education. Students go into nursing, two year trade schools and community college programs. According to current information from one schools guidance department, of the 117 graduates in the class of '91, 37 will attend the 2 year community college and 56 will attend four year colleges. Overall, the district sends 51% of its graduates to four year colleges and 35% to the community college in the area.

Over the past five years, information sent to the governor and legislature, (in a required reporting of the statistical profile of public school districts), showed the following picture for the Central High School District:

Regents diploma	Higher education setting
Class of	Percent
'87 65%	78%
'88 65%	81%
'89 68%	79%
'90 43%	82%
'91 50%	86%

College attendance, without a regents diploma, is possible, typically to a two-year degree program or community college setting. A study reported to the faculty

by a former assistant superintendent of this Central High School District showed, of 200 former district students who attended the local community college, 25% received their Associates degree in two years, 25% received it in three to five years, and the other 50% dropped out of the community college setting.

Teachers have a median of 22 years of experience and over 40 percent of them hold a masters' degree plus 30 more graduate credits. (Reported to the governor and the legislature in the statistical profile of public school districts report.) Despite this high level of experience and training, since the district has moved to a "most challenging" program philosophy for students (meaning most students are being scheduled for regents level classes), teachers have to be retrained to deal with student levels they have not taught before. This is part of the problem this plan wishes to address. Many of these regents students are considered at-risk (of failure) or have been designated as learning disabled.

The student body comes from working class families. Census figures report the average years of education for parents in the district is 11.6 years. In fact, this community places more emphasis on sports participation than on library use. There are two parent organizations helping the school, the traditional parent-teacher organization, and one which was formed especially to encourage and sponsor teams. This contrasts sharply with a situation

where, due to the location of many of the homes, there is no library tax included in their mortgage payments. Most parents in these affected areas choose not to join the library system. (In order to become family members of a library there would be a fee of between \$75.00 and \$95.00 per year, equivalent to the tax other residents pay.)

The 1989 regents exam report, (as reported to the governor and the legislature in the statistical profiles of public school districts), for 10th and 11th graders, placed the districts' population in the lowest quartile ranking in English, social studies, mathematics course I, and biology, when compared to 17 other districts in the same county. At the same time these 11th graders placed in the top quartile on state competency tests in reading and writing, as compared to this identical sampling of districts. It therefore appears that competency is the goal of the community, while most challenging standards are the goal of the district administration. The district's superintendent said, at a recent staff meeting, that this district is changing the values of the community. Teachers have been caught in the middle of this dilemma.

Writer's Work Setting & Role

The writer, a reading and resource room teacher, services students in grades seven through twelve and has taught for 19 years in this district. As a resource room teacher, she works closely with the staff of the school.

The writer is also on the policy board of the district's Teacher and Computer Resource Center, and has given in-service courses in computer use and in understanding and working with the mainstreamed student. During the past four to five years there has been a gradual change in student population, (with the influx of more Asian and Hispanic families), but very little change in teaching staff. Updating the skills of the staff is part of the plan of this proposal. The targeted staff population are four subject area teachers and their ninth grade state regents level classes. The target student population in these classes are six learning disabled adolescents, and five at-risk but non-handicapped students in these same classes. In addition to the four content area teachers, the practicum will also have input from two other resource room teachers, a school social worker, a nurse, a school psychologist and three guidance counselors.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

The Central High School District has instituted a "most challenging program", which refers to a new philosophy. This program has all but eliminated the local diploma track and included most students in the demanding state regents diploma track. The only students exempted from this initiative are those certified as unable to complete anything but an Individual Educational Plan (IEP) diploma. Classroom teachers have multi-level groups in all but Advanced Placement and Honors classes. This grouping includes handicapped learning disabled (LD), mainstreamed emotionally disturbed (ED), and all ability levels of regular students.

Subject area teachers are having difficulty accepting learning disabled youngsters and other at-risk youngsters in their regents level classes. These regular classroom teachers generally do not believe that learning disabled youngsters can succeed in these more demanding classes.

The problem is that secondary classroom teachers have not been trained to deal with these multi-level groups in their regents level classes at grades 9 through 12. This

change to heterogeneous grouping from a system that previously had permitted tracking of lower functioning and non-academic students is also creating a problem for many students.

Although the "most challenging program" is intended to help students achieve all they are capable of, it places a twofold burden on the LD students and their teachers. First, the student does not perceive the new program in a positive manner and second, the teacher does not perceive the LD student in a positive manner.

Historically, there have always been some LD students participating fully in the state's regents diploma program, but some have chosen not to. This has taken the burden away from the classroom teacher, and student acceptance has never been a major problem. With this new initiative, all students are required to participate. The district reports that 79% of the class of '92, 88% of the class of '93, 85% of the class of '94 and 93% of the class of '95 are in regent's programs. By definition, a learning disabled youngster is of average ability, thus, all learning disabled students have been placed in the demanding regents courses. Thus it is no longer enough for the student to have a special resource room class and teacher one period per day. The new district mandate implies that all teachers must help the LD student as well as all their other students meet the demands of the Regent curriculum.

The goal of this practicum in collaborative

consultation is to help students and teachers make adjustments in the regular regents curriculum which will accommodate students with learning problems.

Collaborative consultation is a two-teacher systematic study of the students, the subject and the materials, any of which may need to be adjusted in order to promote learning. Both the resource room teacher and the content teacher take equal responsibility in arriving at solutions for their common problem which is to determine how the students can best learn the material.

Problem Documentation

Problems accommodating students with learning disabilities in regular classes can be found in the literature. Moreover many state departments of education have made recommendations and issued regulations about the placement of learning disabled students in regular classes. This state has recently (1989) added one additional service, and, as a result, the state's Department of Special Education Training and Resource Center undertook the state-wide training of resource room teachers. This additional category of service is called Resource Consultant Teacher, and can be used for a student classified as learning disabled in place of, or combined with direct resource room service. The Resource Consultant Teacher service can be given directly by the consultant to the student in the classroom setting or indirectly by the consultant to the classroom teacher. It is thought that by

the addition of this category, the student will stand to gain the most, as his or her teachers will be assisted in gaining those skills necessary to keep the student in the mainstream. Research has supported the need for this role, and at least 26 states are already providing this type of service to their students.

In the centralized high school district described in this paper there are presently no students receiving the Resource Consultant Teacher service. The writer believes that by the interjection of the Collaborative Consultant model, the district will see the feasibility of using the Resource Consultant Teacher Model in the future for some of the LD students it now serves.

During 1990, President George Bush and the nation's governors announced six national goals for education. Goal #2: was to increase the high school graduation rate to at least 90% by the year 2000. On September 24, 1990, President Bush also said, "We must find new strategies to boost the graduation and literacy rates, strategies that really do get the job done... strategies that really work." (p.19). In 1988, both the Office of Special Education and The National Longitudinal Transition Study, who issue reports for the Office of Education, Washington, D.C., said the drop-out rate for disabled students is at least 10% greater than for non-disabled students. The implications are for teachers and counselors to design intervention strategies as a viable way to change these

statistics. (Gwada & Griggs, 1985).

Askamit (1990), quotes data from the United States Department of Education, showing that 69% of all handicapped students receive most of their education in regular classes. When this is applied to all mildly handicapped students, the figure jumps to 90%. This figure would also include the population generally referred to as at-risk. As general education learns to meet the needs of mildly handicapped and at-risk populations of students, the potential exists for reducing the numbers of identified mildly handicapped and at the same time reaching more teachers and students.

High school teachers tell of the poor motivation and improper study habits these mildly handicapped (learning disabled) and at-risk students possess. Students who are designated learning disabled (LD) usually have the benefit of a special teacher, but those found to be at-risk of academic failure often do not have such additional services. These labels are used to describe youngsters who have, to varying degrees, conditions which have handicapped their academic abilities in the classroom.

This author believes that the single most important strategy that will change the picture for many of these youngsters is excellent teaching. It is therefore with that purpose in mind, that the Collaborative Consultation Model is being investigated in this practicum proposal.

Causative Analysis

Evidence of the problem is supported by observations, interviews, discussions and state and local union surveys. In 1990, teachers expressed distress at the district's policy of "most challenging" program. Students of all abilities are expected to complete regents level courses. Regents level classes have had, until this time, students who have at least average ability and are reading and calculating on or above grade level. State and local union surveys of teachers found that teachers do not feel they have been given opportunities for input into decisions which directly impact on their teaching conditions. The "most challenging program" is an example of one of those decisions.

In 1991, teachers began to experience the impact of the district policy as more and more general and skills level courses were eliminated from district offerings. Skills level classes, which still exist in grades seven and eight, are also known as Title I classes, or remedial-level classes. Students in these classes have recognized deficiencies in reading and sometimes math. In resource room discussions with teachers in the district, one group often targeted as unable to keep up with the coursework were the learning disabled youngsters. Yet, national, state and local surveys find that learning disabled (LD) youngsters spend more than 70% of their time in regular classrooms. (Askamit, 1990). Since collaborative

consultation results in teachers sharing knowledge and responsibility for LD students, and this also impacts on all students, it was decided to include other at-risk students in this proposal.

In summary, the three causes of the problem seem to be:

1. Subject area teachers have never been given the special strategies and skills needed to deal with learning disabled youngsters.
2. Due to a combination of their own poor self-image, and teacher perceptions of them, learning disabled youngsters do not feel capable of completing regents level classes successfully.
3. Subject matter is not broken down into those specific skills needed for mastery, and these skills are not separately taught to facilitate learning.

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

According to West and Idol (1990), collaborative consultation is "... problem solving done among school professionals aimed at prevention of student learning and behavior problems ..." (p.22). It is teachers working together, collaboratively, that will promote the most direct and effective teaching. Deshler, Alley, and Carlson, (1980), said, "without effective cooperative planning between the LD teacher and the regular classroom teacher, the probability of a LD adolescent becoming successfully mainstreamed in the regular classroom is

greatly reduced." (p.9).

Terms such as mainstreamed, regular classroom, LD adolescent and mildly handicapped youngsters are all interwoven in the literature. Compounding the problem of the learning disabled in regular classrooms, is the fact that the at-risk youngster is often one whose learning difficulties do not meet the stringent guidelines of the laws governing learning disabilities or services for the mildly handicapped. Yet this is a youth whose diverse needs must be met by the regular classroom teacher.

Whether that teacher is sharing responsibilities for the student through "peer coaching" (Munro & Elliot, 1987) or engaging in one of the various types of consultant models, (Schulte, Osborne & McKinney, 1990; Fuchs, Fuchs & Bahr, 1990; Huefner, 1988; or Bauwens, Hourcade & Friend, 1989), all of the literature reviewed pointed up the necessity for teachers to support one another as well as share the responsibilities for these students. The Collaborative Consultant Model, as used in this proposal is as described by Idol (1990), West (1990), and West and Idol (1990). It is one in which the teachers are mutually defining problems, coordinating regular and special education services, determining what interventions will be tried and who will be responsible for them. When both teachers accept the responsibility for the education of the youngster they share and work together to assure that learning and success will take place, then it will most

likely take place.

Idol (1990), discusses the science and art of teaching. The science, being what we teach, and the art, being how we teach it. The science and art of teaching are what this proposal will focus on. It is how the literature and the problem relate to one another. The teachers bring to this collaboration different skills and perspectives on teaching. The resource room teacher is one trained in prescriptive teaching and strategy development for individual students, the subject area teacher is skilled in delivering material to groups in interesting and motivating ways. It is the intent of this practicum proposal to join the skills of both of these teachers in order to deliver material to individual students in interesting, yet prescriptive ways, so that the student learns to use strategies that make the mastery of the material possible.

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Goals and Expectations

The overall goal of this practicum proposal was that subject area teachers, who volunteered for this project, working collaboratively with the resource room teacher, would promote the successful completion of the subject area course by the learning disabled and at-risk youngsters in that course.

In a review of the research on learning styles, Brandt (1990), and Levine (1991a), found that our traits, characteristics and aptitudes are determined by many variables, some cognitive, some innate and some probably learned, and that this unique combination of things creates in each of us a learning style. Teachers are said to teach according to their own learning styles or preferences. By using the tools available for assessing learning styles a better match between teacher and student may be produced, thus promoting the goal.

Targeted students were given the O'Brien Learning Channel Preference Test, (see Appendix A) and teacher information was gained from the Modified Meyers-Briggs Test (which was given to all teachers during staff development

training in 1990). Information from both of these instruments was shared with the teachers participating in the practicum in the hope that it would shed light on the teaching-learning process.

Deshler, Alley and Carlson (1980), described early measures which were used to assess learner characteristics. These included informal tests and observations. They also pointed out that setting, other conditions of learning, methods and materials should be considered as well as individual learning style. Many of the newer learning styles inventories take these factors into consideration. Bauer (1987), using the Learning Styles Inventory by Dunn & Dunn, designed materials to match learner strengths. This strategy was found very helpful to the student, and became one of the criteria by which strategies were designed for this investigation. Okebukola (1986), also found that by matching preferences for learning in learning activities, the students showed statistically significant increases in learning. Both researchers conclude that students who are matched do better than those who are not.

Despite these encouraging results, students should not be taught on the basis of one preference or learning styles inventory. Ferrell (1983), and Caldwell (1987), compared several learning styles inventories and found them to be tapping different skills and not highly reliable. They suggest that caution be exercised in using learning styles inventories and agree that there is no one instrument to be

used as the sole program determiner. Information from many sources needs to be considered in order to make judgements about adapting methods and materials in use in the classrooms.

To insure as clear a picture of the learning situation as possible, other tools were used to generate information about student-teacher match or mismatch such as the questionnaires in Appendices B and C. The first was used to survey each teacher's instructional methods, and the second looked at the teacher's openness to classroom adaptations. Informal classroom observations were done following the form presented in Appendix D. These observations were used to facilitate the collaborative process by allowing the resource teacher to visit the subject area teacher's classroom, and then discuss the observation with the teacher. Student evaluations were supplemented by the ongoing diagnostic work of the resource room teacher, or by input from the counselor or other school personnel in the case of the at-risk youngsters.

Another kind of tool which was included to complete the picture of the teacher-learner match/mismatch is called curriculum based assessments. Curriculum based assessments (CBAs) represent a specific group of strategies that measure or assess the instructional materials in use in a particular course. In the past, texts were evaluated using readability formulas, denoting the reading level of a given material. Now, it is considered a better practice to

determine the instructional level of the student based on the actual materials along with determining the level of the materials themselves. Hansell (1981), gave examples of curriculum based assessments being used for diagnosis in content area reading. In fact, there are several approaches recommended: the skills approach to text reading, the introspective approach, and the cognitive (comprehension) approach. These examples serve as a reminder that CBAs can do more than examine skill levels. In designing a CBA one needs to use a variety of strategies. Questions could be included that estimate the learner's ability to deal with the vocabulary, sequence the materials read, find the main idea, understand facts and find details. (see Appendix E). With the older student, metacognitive skills that measure awareness of task, strategy awareness and estimate of one's own performance, should also become part of the assessment. (Wade and Reynolds, 1989). The literature is rich with applications of CBA's to classrooms: Gicking, Shane and Croskery (1989), used CBA in low functioning secondary math classes, Tindal and Parker (1989), used one form of a CBA to tap secondary student skills in reading and writing, while Potter and Wamre (1990), think that assessment of oral reading rate should be added to regular use of CBAs to give the teacher a quick guide to such processing skills as decoding and fluency.

The results of these studies are generally positive,

but all of the researchers call for further investigation. Fuchs and Fuchs (1989), and Fuchs, Fuchs and Hamlett (1990), have investigated various ways that curriculum based management (CBM) can be used to promote long and short range goals for instruction.

Students with severe language disorders are discussed by Candler and Hildreth (1990), who make clear suggestions for strategies to use in the classroom as well as in remediation settings. Graphic organizers, mnemonics and other strategies discussed with the teachers are explained in Appendix F.

Burnette (1987), discusses projects sponsored by the Office of Special Education Programs in the U. S. Department of Education, which supported the development of adapted instructional materials for mainstreamed students. This writer believes that adapting materials may not be as necessary as adapting instruction by teaching those skills and strategies needed for mastery of the material. To facilitate this process CBAs will be introduced in the collaborative process and designed for any teacher who wishes to have this information available about a student.

Expected Outcomes

Specifically, the expected outcomes of the practicum were:

1. The subject area teacher would learn by observing the resource teacher to teach strategies necessary for the successful mastery of the skills of his/her course.

2. The learning disabled youngster (LD) and other at risk students would master those strategies needed to successfully complete their courses.

3. Collaborative consultation would prove to be a way to provide more service to LD youngsters through their teachers, thus facilitating the Resource Consultant Teacher Model in the future.

4. Collaborative consultation would be a way to increase learning in at-risk students.

Measurement of Outcomes

The means of measuring the outcomes of this practicum were to impact on teachers, students, and district policy, as follows:

1. A final outcome would be a file of strategies that the subject area teacher uses and depends on in the teaching process. Evaluation of teacher outcomes were formative and changes were made on an ongoing basis as strategies were tried and skills needed for subject mastery changed.

2. LD youngsters would demonstrate application of the specific strategies after practice in the classroom, at home and in the resource room.

3. Students at-risk of failure identified by the guidance department would also demonstrate application of specific strategies. The teachers' determination of successful application of a skill would be based on direct evidence of application of strategies through homework and

tests and indirectly through grades and comments on report cards. The guidance counselor and other school personnel would also be asked for their input. In this way it would be determined if the model had impact on the at-risk youngster.

4. As LD youngsters received more specific strategy instruction in regular classrooms, the need, as determined by students' grades, for specific resource room periods would diminish and the requests, as determined by teacher initiated interest, for more collaborative consultation would increase. This is part of the Resource Consultant Teacher Model. This long-range outcome would become part of an ongoing evaluation as the year goes on.

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions

Due to the district's "most challenging program", teachers now have multi-level groups in all but advanced placement and honors classes. This includes learning disabled students, mainstreamed emotionally handicapped students, and all ability levels of regular and at-risk students. The problem was that teachers were not trained to deal with these multi-level groups and needed help managing and teaching them.

This solution strategy was planned through collaborative consultation to help teachers deal with learning disabled youngsters in their classes. The possible solutions gleaned from the literature were: one, teachers sharing responsibilities collaboratively; two, using cooperative learning strategies; three, matching student learning style to teaching style; four, using curriculum based assessment rather than standardized tests; five, specific skill intervention training for students to enhance their learning abilities.

Many researchers discussed the fact that teachers sharing responsibilities for the same students should work

collaboratively. (Munro & Elliot, 1987; Schulte, Osborne & McKinney, 1990; Fuchs, Fuchs & Bahr, 1990; Huefner, 1988; and Bauwens, Haurcade & Friend, 1989). This is one of the main reasons why this strategy was chosen as the selected solution. Collaborative consultation involves teachers mutually defining problems, coordinating regular and special education services, determining what interventions will be tried and who will be responsible for them. These ideas were also presented by Idol (1990), West (1990), and West and Idol (1990). Both the subject area teachers and the resource room teachers bring different skills and strengths to the process, but true collaboration allows them to exchange expertise.

Results of cooperative learning methods and other peer influenced strategies used in subject area classes with LD students in them have shown that the LD students develop positive self-esteem. Rockler (1987), Taymans (1989), Tateyama-Sniezek (1990), Peterson & Miller (1990), and Levine (1991b), all turn to cooperative learning strategies in the secondary classroom as a means of promoting a classroom climate that produces active and involved students. One of the benefits of cooperative learning appears to be a greater acceptance of student differences, and a student becoming aware of his/her own strengths. Therefore promoting these peer and cooperative learning strategies would be a possible solution for one of the perceived problems in dealing with this issue. The

writer encouraged such strategies.

Other ideas generated from the literature relate to the selection of teachers. Fuchs, Fuchs and Bahr (1990), Idol (1990) and West and Idol (1990), in discussing the stages/steps of consultation all stress fact that there are a group of collaboration skills which must be learned before any meaningful consultation can take place. The writer has been taught these skills (by West and Idol during a state-wide summer institute offered to special education teachers) and strongly believed that subject area teacher participation in this project should be voluntary.

The climate of a classroom has as much to do with what students learn as does the content of the course. Peterson (1988), discusses the idea of the "thoughtful professional" (the teacher) as one who needs as much study as the student. To understand the thinking, performance and behavior of the teacher is to understand the climate of the classroom. In two unrelated studies, Rogers and Stevenson (1988), demonstrated that children do not always learn what is in the curriculum. This holds true for adapted curriculum as well. Cantrell and Cantrell (1980) and Reisberg (1990), indicate that teacher training must also include the specific strategies that will be used with the children targeted to be helped.

In order to create a positive climate it is felt that students should be active and aware of the intent of the learning process itself. Billingsly and Wildman (1990),

described metacognition as, "the knowledge about and regulation of one's own learning" (cognitive processes). (p.18). Siedenberg (1988), agrees that when the learner knows what tasks to perform and regulates self performance, learning is enhanced. Deshler, Alley and Carlson (1980), describe a learning strategies model that works with learning disabled high school youngsters, enabling them to succeed in demanding curriculum. Skills such as visual imagery, rehearsal, reciprocal questioning and clustering are taught, practiced and applied. Peterson (1988), also suggests that teachers should be aware that cognitive skills, such as defining, describing, comparing, reasoning and summarizing, which are content specific, should be taught in the content classroom. The teaching of specific skills can best be accomplished after careful analysis of the learner and the task.

Some of the concepts of precision teaching, (a specific teaching methodology based on the framework of Skinner and the operant conditioning methods he used) can be utilized in a regular classroom to promote cognitive learning. West, Young and Spooner (1990), Lindsay (1990), and Lovett (1990), find that teachers trained in the use of strategy instruction improve the application of these strategies and their usefulness to students. Such strategy instruction includes: self monitoring and recording, charts, graphic organizers, displays, keywords, study guides and webbing, (a system of linking ideas together).

Pennell (1985), studied how understanding both brain function and learning styles gave students the means to take charge of their learning. Mamchur (1990), contends that matching a student's learning style to study techniques can become part of the choice of the student, enabling him to find the activity that suits him best. Steinberger (1989), suggests that students who do not have any strategies need to learn them through direct teaching. The writer feels that the collaborative design of and teaching of strategies was the most important part of this work.

Description of Selected Solution

Analysis of learner needs and creation of strategies to meet those needs has always been a strength of the learning disabilities teacher. Through collaborative consultation, the classroom teacher was able to engage in the process of strategy development, intervention and direct instruction. Many useful strategies already existed and were introduced in the consultation process. Specialized training, participation in conferences and reading journals in the fields of remedial education and learning disabilities are the domain of the resource room teacher. Because of this, the writer, a resource room teacher, introduced a wealth of strategies into the consultation process. Among the strategies were:

TELSQA, (Tama & Martinez, 1988), which stands for, Title, Examination of information for clues, Look for

difficult words, Self-Question and Answer the questions, is a strategy to help the learner with text materials.

Semantic Feature Analysis, (Pittelman, Heimlich, Berglund & French, 1991), which is a variation of "visual organizers" (Clarke, 1991), or graphic organizers (Horton, Lovitt & Bergerud, 1990), is an important organizational strategy for notetaking and pre-writing.

Seven Steps, (Barclay, 1990), refers to the following steps, (1) Pre Reading Plan (2) Survey (3) Semantic Mapping (similar to graphic organizers) (4) Story Map (5) Mental Imagery (6) Learning Logs and (7) Question-Answer Relationship(s). These steps include reading, writing, visualizing and thinking strategies.

COPS, (West & Idol, 1990), is a strategy for self-monitoring written work. The acronym stands for Capitalized? Overall appearance? Punctuation? Spelled right?

FORCE, (Wehrung-Schaffner & Sapona, 1990), is a test-taking strategy. Students Find out what to study, Organize materials, Review, Concentrate and develop a study sheet, practice with Early exam (pre test) is the final step.

Followay and Patton (1989), also included many special education study skills, techniques and strategies in their special issue of Academic Therapy.

Based on the research, the writer included the following strategies:

1. Matching learning styles to teaching styles.

Although there are no certain ways of assessing learning and teaching styles, it is believed that the pursuit of this information will serve as training and awareness of learner differences for the group of teachers involved. Student learning style was assessed by using O'Brien Learning Channel Preference Test. (See Appendix A.) Teaching style was assessed by using the modified Meyers-Briggs test (previously administered to all district teachers).

2. Developing curriculum-based assessments (CBAs) from text and other course materials. Any teacher who wished to use text and other printed material regularly with these students could know how well the student was able to deal with this material.

3. Developing individualized strategies and tailoring specific skills that the classroom teacher felt would have the greatest impact on course mastery.

4. Encouraging direct teaching of strategies and skills by the classroom teacher. Using cooperative learning strategies (to enhance self esteem) by teachers who were interested.

The writer believes that when teachers invest time and energy into solving a shared problem and base their work on prior research and build upon it, their work will be successful. Given a setting in which subject area teachers are dealing with learning disabled and at-risk students in demanding courses, this practicum was specifically designed

to meet the objectives, through activities, and answer the following questions:

- . What skills are needed by students to succeed in each content area classrooms? Teacher surveys were used to help determine this. (See Appendices B and C).

- . Is there a match between learner's style and teacher's style? Informal observations helped augment information from learning and teaching style tools. (See Appendix D).

- . What skills are needed first in each classroom? The collaborative process was used to elicit this from each subject area teacher.

- . How can these identified skills be mastered by students? Introduction of specific skills took place during the consultation process.

- . How did the classroom teacher learn to teach skills and strategies? Modeling of skills by the resource room teacher was used.

- . How will the students master the skills and strategies? Direct teaching and modeling was used in the classroom by the subject area teacher.

- . How will we know when students have mastered the targeted skills and strategies? CBA's were among the variety of teacher means used to determine this. (See Appendices E and F).

- . How will the project be evaluated? Interviews and report cards will be used. (See Appendix G).

Report of Action Taken

The steps of the practicum implementation were:

1. Selection of teachers of the targeted students, from those teachers who volunteered their time, after understanding the project.
2. Selection, by guidance of at-risk students from the class lists of the chosen teachers.
3. Gathering of information on teachers and students to determine the match or mismatch of:
 - a) teaching style with learning style.
 - b) reading level and/or writing level of course materials with students' reading levels.
 - c) instructional practices and policies with students' ability to comply with those policies.
4. Collaborative planning and design of strategies, lessons and materials to facilitate mastery of content.
5. Evaluation of the project and suggestions for change.

Implementation of the practicum project in collaborative consultation for the fall, 1991, followed this calendar:

During the first two to three weeks of school numerous scheduling changes took place. It was determined that this would be a good time to discuss the project's goals and

purposes and to answer any preliminary inquiries made by interested teachers.

The first week of implementation concentrated on the selection of the teachers. A meeting date was set during this week to review teacher information from the Meyers-Briggs Test and questionnaires. The teachers were told that they had to be willing to spend the time and keep a log.

The second week was spent reviewing teaching style and learning style. Teachers studied the match or mismatch of their teaching styles with the learning styles of the targeted students in their classes.

The third week was devoted to classroom observations and curriculum based assessments which were requested by all four teachers.

During the fourth week teachers decided on and prioritized the skills their students needed to succeed in their classes. For example, the lecturer would focus on improving students' notetaking skills, developing graphic organizers and other such aids, while the overhead projector and filmstrip user would concentrate on ways to enhance visual and organizational skills of students so they could successfully learn with this teaching style.

Week five began strategy intervention teaching. Logs and comments were reviewed at each weekly meeting to deal with any special problems or situations that had arisen.

Week six involved reinforcement and practice of the

chosen strategy. Teachers collaborated for a minimum of one class period per week, but often more frequently.

At this point in the practicum a mid-report was issued which helped the team to focus on the fact that behavioral interventions were needed with some of the students. Mid-marking period reports by the teachers and ongoing articulation in the collaborative sessions brought this information to the fore.

The practicum teacher sought the help of the school psychologist and the building special needs team in order to put some behavioral interventions in place. Parent conferences were also held to enhance this process.

Week seven of the practicum was used to determine whether the first strategies needed to be modified. A second skill needed for the class was targeted, and a second strategy introduced. Two weeks were required for one strategy to be practiced before another was introduced. Teachers continued working together weekly to develop additional strategies to use.

Week eight expanded on and/or practiced the second strategy and reinforced both the first and second. Students applied strategies and demonstrated their use, either in homework, classwork or testing. Successful use of a strategy by a student was passing a test, completing an assignment or other such teacher determination as noted in their logs and reported in meetings.

During weeks nine and ten a third strategy was

introduced and practiced where needed. Not all teachers worked on three strategies.

Weeks eleven and twelve time were spent both teaching and evaluating. Students were given guided practice. Students, counselors and other school personnel were interviewed and report card grades and teacher logs were collected. The project results were delayed while second marking period report card grades were finalized.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

Student Results

Teachers in this suburban junior senior high school setting have been faced with a new "non-tracking" district policy and now have multi-level groups in all but advanced placement and honors classes. The problem was that teachers were not trained to deal with these multi-level groups and needed help managing and teaching them.

This solution strategy was planned by a resource room teacher of learning disabled youth to use collaborative consultation to help teachers deal with learning disabled and at-risk youngsters in their classes. The strategy involved: one, teachers sharing responsibilities collaboratively; two, matching student learning style to teaching style; three, using cooperative learning strategies; four, using curriculum based assessment; five, specific skill intervention training to enable students to learn in these more demanding classes.

The study included two groups of students, the learning disabled, serviced one period per day in a resource room setting, and the at-risk (of failure) students identified by counselors and teachers. Both groups of students are in

ninth grade regular regents level classes.

In order to have as clear a record of what was taking place, all of the teachers involved kept a log. Students were also asked for comments on strategies they were learning. In this way, through thoughtful record keeping, all events of the plan were documented, and any unexpected events were adjusted or modified in a timely fashion.

Evaluation of the plan was ongoing and formative. Two tangible evidences of success were expected to be the students' grades and the teachers and students perceptions of their success. Therefore actual grades were compared to the expected grades (as determined in interviews with the teachers, students, counselors and others). Teacher and student perceptions of the practicum were obtained through interview (Appendix G) as well as analysis of the data described above.

The learning disabled students perceptions of the project, as summarized by their final interviews, showed that students were aware that teachers changed their method of teaching and/or other classroom procedures during the prior twelve weeks. The changes were perceived as mostly positive, helping to make the classes more understandable. The negative comments had to do with having to produce more work such as, notetaking, having to complete a graphic organizer or fill in a skeleton outline by listening to the lecture. (See Appendix H).

Following is a description of each of the six learning

disabled (resource room) students to give the reader a better understanding of this student population.

Student one is a diabetic whose learning problems are complicated by a poor attendance record which jeopardizes his ability to pass his courses. Much time and effort has been spent trying to get his mother to improve his attendance. He is motivated by adults. His learning style is haptic (hands on), and he is a global, (likes to know the whole picture), sequential (step by step) learner.

Student two is new to the resource room this year, coming into some mainstreamed classes from self-contained classes. He is motivated to move out of special education entirely. (He still is in a special education English class.) He is a visual (show me) learner, with auditory (but tell me at the same time) strengths. He successfully uses books on tape as long as he is looking at the print matter. He is highly organized but needs constant direction. He is an analytic (let me figure things out) and sequential thinker.

Student three lives with a foster father in a home with other Vietnamese youngsters like himself, one of whom is his natural brother. His severe language problems thwart his ability to express himself in regular classes. It is believed that his language problems do not stem from a true learning disability, as he is able to learn quite easily when he is motivated to do so. He is an auditory learner, and thinks sequentially.

Student four has many learning and behavioral problems. He comes from a home that may have been abusive and/or alcohol involved. He responds better to a kind word than a reprimand, and criticism can provoke outbursts and inappropriate classroom behaviors. The one period per day resource room may not be sufficient to deal with all of the emotional and learning problems student four has. He needs quiet in order to concentrate, therefore he must be in a separate location for tests. He is a visual learner who likes auditory reinforcement. He is also a sequential thinker. At present he is working on a behavioral contract with his resource room teacher monitoring him. It is hoped that this will help him keep on track as he is extremely disorganized and forgetful. This student probably has an attention deficit disorder in addition to his learning disability.

Student five is a bright youngster, whose verbal ability misleads many teachers who tend to think he can do more than he is able to. He has severe written expressive disorders which retard his ability to perform in his classes. He is motivated by adults and by himself. Student five is an auditory learner, a good reader and is highly organized. He is a global and sequential thinker.

Student six is an auditory learner, but his culturally determined listening habits are very poor. His learning style is both haptic and concrete and this is misleading to teachers who tend to judge him as less bright than he is. He is a daydreamer in class and has to be kept on task. Student

six is being tutored in reading outside of school at his own request. The tutor has collaborated with the practicum teacher on developing strategies and creating lessons that will work for him. They are also sharing information gained from his classroom teachers. Student six's severe problems in reading and writing hamper his ability to pass his academically demanding classes.

These six learning disabled youngsters are typical of the learning disabled population, as well as the many non-disabled, at-risk, ninth graders. This period of development is one of the most difficult periods to teach. These youngsters are often motivated by peers while dismissing input from themselves or adults. By collaborating, the teachers have been sharing strategies that work with each of the youngsters. When teachers learn strategies, discuss behavioral interventions, like positive reinforcement (Downing, Moran, Myles & Ormsbee, 1991), and include direct, structured and cooperative learning activities in class presentations, these learning disabled youngsters are better able to expand on their classroom experiences. The learning disabled youngsters all have one period of additional time with a resource room specialist who is working to help them pass their subjects. The other resource room teachers working with them reported feeling the need for more contact with the content area classroom teachers.

An analysis of these students' report card grades for the first and second marking periods follows:

TABLE I
Report of Learning Disabled Students' Grades

LD STUDENT SUBJECT	MP I GRADE	CLASS MEAN	MP II GRADE	CLASS MEAN	GRADE ESTIM- ATE

ONE					
ENGLISH	75	77.8	60	69.2	65
SOCIAL					
STUDIES	55	68.5	80	70.0	65
SCIENCE	*		*		
TWO					
ENGLISH	*		*		
SOCIAL					
STUDIES	75	68.5	65	70.0	65
SCIENCE	*		*		
THREE					
ENGLISH	80	77.8	70	69.2	65
SOCIAL					
STUDIES	80	68.5	85	70.0	70
SCIENCE	*		*		
FOUR					
ENGLISH	65	77.8	65	69.2	65
SOCIAL					
STUDIES	55	68.5	55	70.0	65
SCIENCE	*		*		
FIVE					
ENGLISH	85	85.9	85	79.2	70
SOCIAL					
STUDIES	75	68.5	75	70.0	70
SCIENCE	70	76.0	70	72.5	70
SIX					
ENGLISH	85	85.9	85	79.2	65
SOCIAL					
STUDIES	75	68.5	65	70.0	65
SCIENCE	70	76.0	65	72.5	65

 * Denotes class which was not in the practicum study.

Grade estimate is based on intellectual ability, previous history in this subject and nature of learning disability and was arrived at after consultation with counselors, resource room teachers and last years content area teachers.

These ninth grade learning disabled students did well in their classes, all meeting or surpassing their expectation in these targeted areas except one student. The one is the student where a behavioral contract is being tried to help him focus on the academic content of his classes without causing disruptions or forgetting his required materials. This contract is being monitored by his resource room teacher. This type of problem is even more frequent with the at-risk population than with the learning disabled.

Generally there is no specific supplementary help for the at-risk students. They were targeted for three reasons: first, all of these students had difficulty in skills-level classes in grade eight; second, they are all now in regents level classes for the first time; third, they arrive in these classes with reputations and stigmas from their previous grade. These students follow a regular regents level program, and can see their individual content area teachers for extra help. Most of the students also receive reading instruction on alternate days for the entire year. (During the twelve weeks of the practicum, four of the five students in this targeted at-risk population were in reading classes for six weeks). The five students are described as follows:

At-risk student one is a youngster who seems less motivated in English, reading and social studies than does his twin brother. Their other siblings have also had academic problems in this school. The boys are described as strong in math and science, weak in verbal areas. They are .

both receiving help in reading. As a result of this collaboration, student one, who seems sullen and anti-social, has been recommended for peer tutoring to help him in his academic classes and to enhance his self image. This tutoring is a service available through supervision by our social worker.

At-risk student two was identified by his counselors in grades 8 and 9, and his English, social studies and science teachers this year, as being at risk of failing. He is very disruptive in the classroom and has difficulty paying attention. Much teacher and class time is spent keeping him in line. Moving his seat, keeping him for detention, calling his parents and referring him to administration in charge of discipline all work for short periods of time. Student two was referred to the psychologist who said he "doesn't meet the criteria for learning disabilities classification," but he is currently re evaluating him on the basis of this projects recommendations. Parent-counselor-teacher conferences about him were another outcome of this project.

At-risk student three was described as "disconnected" from classwork by her science, reading and English teachers. She was having difficulty passing several subjects. Her eighth grade counselor had recommended academic intervention and had referred her for evaluation of possible learning disabilities, but it appears that she has none. She is a poor reader and a borderline student who moved from the skills classification and is in need of special attention.

At-risk student four puzzled his ninth grade counselor, reading, social studies and English teachers, because he seemed highly capable at some times but off track and distracted at other times. He was described by all of his teachers as in danger of failing. Based on these referrals, investigations have been made by other school personnel uncovering a problem with alcoholism in a parent. It was also discovered that his IQ score had dropped from 139 in second grade to only 89 in the latest test, in eighth grade. He is now receiving individual help and family counseling.

At-risk student five's behavior was described by her social studies, English and reading teachers as very out of step with the group. The school psychologist says it is possible that she has attention deficit disorder, and that behavioral strategies may help. The psychologist has been asked to review her case with the teachers.

The estimated grade for the learning disabled students as well as the at-risk students has been determined to be 65 in most cases. This is due to the fact that their performance last year was considered to be adequate only because they were placed in the skills classification. Without a skills level of instruction at this grade, each of the eleven students in the study is considered at risk of failure in the more demanding regents level classes. The fact that the learning disabled youngsters sometimes do much better than expected is a testament to their resource room help and accommodations such as testing modifications.

One striking result of the project has been the variety of academic and behavioral interventions undertaken on behalf of the at-risk youngsters. Since there was no opportunity to discuss the practicum with these students, they were not interviewed.

At the end of marking period two, the school made public a list of students who failed two or more subjects. The results, analyzed by grade are as follows:

Grade	Total number of students	Number who failed two or more	Percent of grade
7	129	12	9
8	115	26	23
9	119	29	24
10	121	39	32
11	121	36	30
12	110	21	19
Total	715	163	23

In a school which has a most challenging program, the students and the teachers are struggling to succeed. These results indicate the extent and difficulty of the problem. It is apparent from the data that when students don't receive specific help in the ninth grade the problem accelerates.

Another important variable to be reconciled is the number of learning disabled and at-risk students a teacher has in his/her classroom. In English class A there were six targeted students in the class of 29 (21%). English class B had four targeted students in the class of 25 (16%). The science class had four out of the 30 students (13%) while in

social studies the teacher was responsible for all eleven students of his 29, a full 42% of his class. This ratio plays an important part in the success rate of the students.

An analysis of the first and second marking period report cards grades for the at-risk students are as follows:

TABLE II
Report of At-Risk Students' Grades

AT-RISK STUDENT	SUBJECT	MP I GRADE	CLASS MEAN	MP II GRADE	CLASS MEAN	GRADE ESTIM- ATE

ONE						
	ENGLISH	80	85.9	70	79.2	65
	SOCIAL					
	STUDIES	80	68.5	75	70.0	65
	SCIENCE	*		*		
TWO						
	ENGLISH	65	77.8	70	69.2	65
	SOCIAL					
	STUDIES	65	68.5	50	70.0	65
	SCIENCE	55	76.0	60	72.5	65
THREE						
	ENGLISH	65	85.9	65	79.2	65
	SOCIAL					
	STUDIES	70	68.5	65	70.0	65
	SCIENCE	60	76.0	65	72.5	65
FOUR						
	ENGLISH	85	85.9	75	79.2	65
	SOCIAL					
	STUDIES	75	68.5	60	70.0	65
	SCIENCE	*		*		
FIVE						
	ENGLISH	80	85.9	75	79.2	65
	SOCIAL					
	STUDIES	60	68.5	60	70.0	65
	SCIENCE	*		*		

* Denotes class which was not in the practicum study.
.Grade estimate is based on intellectual ability and previous history in this subject and was arrived at after consultation with counselors and last years content area teachers.

Teacher Results

One of the most dramatic results of collaborative consultation is the collegiality and professionalism that develops among the teachers. There are actually ten teachers involved in teaching the major subjects (English, social studies, science and math) to the ninth grade LD students. The four who volunteered and worked on the project were committed to improving their students chances of passing their courses as no release time was given to them for their participation. Marie Somers Hill, (1991) discussing the benefits of collegial pairs mentions the respect, understanding and professional growth that takes place. This was the case in this ninth grade collaboration. These results were echoed by each teacher in the project. The newest member to teaching said, "It was reassuring to learn that others had the same kinds of problems I was having," while one of the most senior in experience said, "It was good to realize that you are not the only person having trouble with these kids". The teachers' words in their final interview may best serve to summarize their perception of the results. (See Appendix I).

Teachers summed up the project by stressing how they benefitted personally, professionally and collegially. One specific objective which was met was the matching of teaching style to both student learning style and student ability level. Teachers learned to determine the skills needed for a particular part of the curriculum, anticipate where students

might experience problems and design strategies to overcome those problems. Strategies were not complex, but were selected specifically to meet the students' needs and were directly teachable. Such strategies as the use of graphic organizers, the pre-teaching of vocabulary and pre and post testing of reading comprehension became part of the lesson plan. The blending of expertise by the teachers led to more creative lesson plans. By sharing responsibility, through collaboration, teaching became more focused and effective. All of the objectives pertaining to teaching methods were met.

Each teacher was involved in examination and modification of his or her teaching methods. Following is a summary of their initial attitudes and instructional practice, and a description of the interventions and strategies developed with each teacher.

The project worked with two highly experienced English teachers, each with administrative and supervisory duties. Despite their years of experience and expertise these teachers gained strategies which they found useful in the classroom setting with the targeted youngsters. They used CBAs for three works of literature and collaborated on tests and lessons to enhance students' understanding of each work. They were intrigued by the idea of cooperative learning strategies having positive social effects on learning disabled students. Both teachers share information freely with one another and with the other teachers in the

project. Initially, their surveys revealed:

English teacher A, was very structured. Her teaching style is intuitive, outspoken, challenging and demanding. She is full of enthusiasm for her students and her work. She reported using 50% lecture and 50% discussion in her classes. Her tests included all types of questions and she uses hand-outs and study guides extensively. Although she would not accept any extra-credit reports or work, she was available for extra help daily and would accept all kinds of modifications for learning disabled youngsters. She sends progress reports routinely to parents and counselors and keeps the resource room teachers informed as well.

Through collaborative consultation, the inclusion of extra credit for outside reading and the construction and use of CBAs for reading comprehension was provided by teacher A. Reading worksheets to use in connection with literature and tests, and graphic organizers were constructed or modified. Mnemonics for punctuation, reading and studying were discussed. The technique of think-pair-share, a cooperative learning strategy, was shared during a meeting of the teachers and also became part of the classroom methodology.

English teacher B used textbooks, but does not lecture at all. She extensively used questioning techniques and gave students many charts and advanced organizers. Her teaching style includes being highly organized and controlling. She had a tendency to be critical, but applied logic and understanding in her work with students to mediate

this trait. She worked on projects and allowed for extra credit. This teacher would accept all kinds of modifications for learning disabled students. She was available for extra help three times per week. Progress reports are issued to parents, counselors and resource room teachers on a regular basis.

Much of the one-on-one collaboration with teacher B centered around the design and inclusion of cooperative learning strategies into the classroom literature program. She has designed several cooperative learning activities and is continuing to develop more. The group collaborative meetings were a helpful source of information about the students and helped her to focus on behavioral strategies needed to deal with a number of disruptive students. There were several meetings, one of which included guidance counselors, which focused exclusively on how to deal with these behaviors. The classroom modifications dealt with arranging for extra credit for outside reading and modifying graphic organizers. A new tool for teacher B was the CBAs, (reading comprehension worksheets) which she will continue to use for evaluative purposes.

Science teacher C is serious, thorough and well organized. His teaching style is practical for the students and is delivered with competence. He reported using several different instructional practices. He used study guides and handouts, but did not use the textbook, as he felt that the text was too difficult for the students. He considered

himself a lecturer, spending more than 50% of his time lecturing and questioning students. He did permit extra credit policies and had a liberal attitude towards modifications for learning disabled students. He is available for extra help two times per day. Progress reports are regularly sent to all involved with the student except the resource room teachers.

Procedures in this classroom changed as a result of the one-on-one collaboration which dealt with using the textbook as an adjunct tool for learning. With the construction of reading comprehension CBAs, graphic organizers, outline frames and vocabulary worksheets, teacher C began to match the level of the students with the level of the materials at hand. Teacher C moved quickly from concept to concept as "there is much material to cover to get these students ready for the state regents exam." Students needed to be able to keep up with the fast pace, take notes, do homework and learn from a textbook. Students needed to improve in both notetaking and homework skills. First, modifications were made in the teacher's presentation of materials. Through the use of the overhead projector instead of the blackboard the teacher gained a better sense of the way the class was grasping the materials. Next, the way in which notes were given and tests organized was revised. Through the introduction of CBAs and pre-vocabulary exercises the teacher now has a closer match between ability level of the students and difficulty of the materials. Benefits were also gained

through the group collaborative sharing meetings. An additional result was increased contact and communication with resource room teachers.

Social studies teacher D's style is quick, resourceful and skillful. He is highly logical, very experienced and structured. He reported extensive use of handouts and dittos. He is a lecturer, using more than 50% of his time in lecturing and questioning. He reported very little use of the textbook, as he found it very cursory in the information it gave the student. No extra credit projects were allowed. His attitude towards modifications was not flexible. He had this class during a period when the resource room was not available, and would not permit extra time, re-writing or oral responses for learning disabled students. He is available to students for extra help daily and often gives review sessions before a test. Progress reports are sent often to parents and counselors, but he was not in the habit of sharing them with the resource room teachers.

Teacher D used the textbook for homework occasionally, but is basically a lecturer. He expects the students to take notes and remember facts for his multiple choice, true false type tests. The skills needed in his class are for notetaking, studying (for memorization) and reading of text and supplementary materials. Strategies were introduced to help the students master this course, as this teacher organized it. First, the textbook was modified to facilitate its' use by the students. The text was made a usable

resource for students by creating a glossary. Making the text a supplementary learning aide for the student, benefitted not only the student, but the teacher as well. In addition, the creation of CBAs (reading comprehension worksheets) for use with the text and on tests facilitated a better match between the materials and the student. Second, class notetaking was enhanced with graphic organizers so that the students could get more out of the lectures. Finally, the teacher's willing acceptance of alternate testing conditions for the learning disabled youngsters in his class was another positive result from this collaboration. As the resource room is closed during this class period, it required cooperative efforts from several staff members to make this a reality. Although the teacher had been trying to accommodate the needs of the learning disabled students on his own, once the collaborative brainstorming took place, methods of accommodation became effective for the student and more accepted by the teacher.

Collaborative consultation is a time consuming activity. Only the dedication of the teachers in this project, along with the input, help and support of the other resource room teachers, guidance counselors, social worker and school psychologist made this process possible.

Practicum Teacher Results

The practicum teacher anticipated certain results, and was surprised by others in the project. The anticipated results were as follows:

1. Teachers would have a better understanding of the learning disabled student after examining learning styles preference information and comparing it with their own teaching styles information. Through this process, teachers did become more conscious of their styles of teaching and of how this effected the students.

2. Curriculum based assessments (CBA's) gave teachers a more realistic feel for how the students were able to handle the text material of the course.

3. Direct teaching of strategies and skills pertaining to notetaking and vocabulary were necessary in order for students to successfully use text material and other outside aides.

4. After collaborative consultation, teachers would continue to seek out the practicum teacher's expertise in order to plan strategies for the learning disabled youngsters in their classes. (They have all said they would do this.)

The results which were not anticipated were:

1. Teachers worked as a group (or team) helping and supporting one another, as much as they worked one-on-one. Teaching is perhaps one of the most isolated jobs there is, which accounts for a great deal of stress and self-doubt, the team approach enabled the teachers to see themselves as true professionals and value one another.

2. Teachers already had many strategies which they were able to draw on under the direction of the practicum teacher, thus the design of strategies was accomplished much more

easily than anticipated.

3. The need for outside intervention, especially for the at-risk students, was an outcome of the team effort and involved parents, school psychologist, nurse, social worker and special needs team. This would not necessarily have been brought about by an individual teachers' concerns.

4. Cooperative learning activities are resisted by newer teachers, perhaps because they need to feel in complete control of the group, and by more experienced teachers, perhaps because they have established habitual ways of teaching certain materials. A concerted effort is needed to introduce these activities. We must foster the development of teacher time to rehearse and observe successful models of cooperative learning strategies in their own curriculum areas.

Discussion

A review of the results of the practicum indicate that the expected outcomes were not only met but were surpassed in some cases. Expected outcome one was that the subject area teacher would learn to teach strategies necessary for the learning disabled and at-risk student to successfully master his or her course. Each teacher did in fact learn new strategies, modify teaching practices and determine what would make the successful course completion more attainable.

Expected outcome two was that the learning disabled youngster and other at-risk students would master those

strategies needed to successfully complete their courses. All of the learning disabled youngsters successfully completed their courses (with a passing average thus far) except one (who has a contract with his resource room teacher in an attempt to help him succeed in the mainstream by the end of the year). Two of the at-risk youngsters successfully completed their courses (with a passing average thus far). But of the other three at-risk youngsters, one is now being screened by the psychologist for extra services, one will be the subject of a case-conference and one is already receiving counseling for emotional problems. These interventions would not have been pursued without the project.

Expected objective three was that collaborative consultation would result in more services being provided for LD youngsters through their teachers, thus facilitating the Resource Consultant Teacher Model in the future. It appears that the model has not only provided more service to the LD youngsters, but also is positively impacting on the at-risk students in the same settings. This is a critical aspect of the project. It is doubtful that those at-risk youngsters would have been served as well without the efforts of the collaborative consultation project.

Expected objective four was also met, which was that collaborative consultation would be a way to increase learning in at-risk students. Cohen and deBettencourt (1991) listed seven school factors that can contribute to success for at-risk students. Factor number five was a "high degree

of passing grades in ninth grade." (p.269). It seems that this is a crucial time for youngsters at-risk of failure or of dropping out.

All education depends on the ability of teachers and administration to work together. If the school is to serve its student population well, it will have to accommodate teachers who wish to collaborate and expand their own expertise. Teachers working together are the subject of much of the current literature on school improvement, school reform and site-based-management. (Bauwens, Hourcade, & Friend, 1989, Evans, 1991, Fuchs, Fuchs & Bahr, 1990, Gursky, 1989, Hill, 1991, Huefner, 1988, Idol, 1990, Munro & Elliot, 1987, and West & Idol, 1990). This body of literature points to the fact that teachers working collaboratively enhance classroom performance by confirming and strengthening the practice of good teaching. This in turn provides opportunities for individual growth, breaks down the isolation teachers often experience and opens lines of communication among many professionals who are serving a common population. Stamford University educational researcher Lee Shulman said,

Restructured schools, as we envision them are places where teachers have the opportunity to carefully document what they do, what their students are doing, and to work collaboratively with their peers on drawing the proper inferences from that kind of documentation. That's a rare opportunity for teachers today. (Guersky, 1989, p.36).

The Director of the Educator's Forum at Harvard Graduate School of Education, Claryce Evans (1991) said, " When

teachers focus on their own concerns, they solve pressing problems without depending on the bureaucracy, and students benefit at once." (p.11).

If we are to create a climate in which every student will maximize his or her potential, then teachers must be free to explore all of the possibilities for that student. The current use of personnel must be reevaluated, specialists and generalists must work together to reach each and every child. It is unrealistic to expect the chemistry to be right between every teacher and every child, but what tips the balance in the child's favor is the opportunity for teachers to seek and get help from their peers.

As was seen in this short practicum, it is the concerted effort of teachers working together that will result in the development of strategies and solutions to meet the needs of learning disabled, at-risk and difficult youngsters. We need to find more ways to reach the at-risk population. We need to give them more services and more meaningful classroom settings. We need to break away from stereotyped roles of classroom teacher, specialist, psychologist, social worker, and use each person according to his or her strengths. We are reaching the learning disabled youngsters in the resource room setting, but we can use the same personnel and the same delivery of service as is described in the Resource Consultant Teacher Model to reach the at-risk student as well.

Recommendations

This practicum in collaborative consultation has demonstrated that learning disabled and at-risk students should be directly taught skills and strategies of learning to promote success. The variables that should continue to be explored deal with strategy intervention of academic skills (like notetaking and study), metacognitive intervention (the direct teaching of thinking skills) and attribution intervention (dealing with developing positive attitudes). When students can comfortably use strategies that match their individual learning styles and needs and can accommodate a teachers style of presentation, they will truly be successful. This requires a conscious use of strategies on the part of the student which some authors refer to as cognitive strategies. Seidenberg (1988) recommends direct teaching of cognition while Harris and Pressley (1991) caution that "strategy instruction sometimes has resembled an imposition of static routines on passive learners." (p.394). Both authors however, stress the importance of the learners involvement in the learning process. Fulk and Mastropieri (1990), in discussing the training of positive attitudes through attributional retraining, say that it is not enough to require students to "try harder" but cognitive skills training should be added to specific skill training in order to insure the acquisition of a positive attitude that is based in reality. It is recommended that:

1. The student population be broken down into small

teams, groups, families or units, which consist of a small targeted group of students on a given grade level.

2. These targeted student populations be "managed" by a team or group leader who will coordinate the efforts on that team or groups' behalf.

3. Ninth graders be given priority when establishing these groups or teams as it appears that this is a crucial time in their development and academic careers.

Using a collaborative consultant model teachers were better able to satisfy district demands and student needs. The "most challenging program" of the centralized high school district has required that all teachers deal with learning disabled and other at-risk students in their regular regents level classes. The practicum project found that teachers were able to understand and teach these diverse groups of students after engaging in collaboration with one another and with a specialist accustomed to this population. Roland Barth, (1991) founding director of the Principal's Center at Harvard University, said, "Serious change will come only from a collective effort-e.g., a school team, a school improvement council-which stimulates, envisions, observes, plans, implements and monitors change." (p.23). It is to that very end that the collaborative consultant model is recommended. As the district changes to its vision of the most challenging program, the collective effort of interested reflective teachers is needed to revitalize teaching practices and adapt to the needs of this expanded student population. Tindal,

Shinn and Rodden-Nord (1990) isolated eleven variables which impact on the consultation process. They concluded that two of these significant variables are which people are involved and what process is used. The people involved in consultation need to be skillful in interpersonal skills and provided with time and support for their efforts. The administration must make a commitment to the project, allowing scheduled time for the consulting process to take place. The consulting process works best when teachers respect each other and have a strong well established work history together. The process of consultation will not work if the problem-solving efforts of the teachers cannot be implemented. A climate of change brings with it the potential for reflective study of those conditions under which change can occur. This formative process of systematic study, evaluation, adjustment and further study works! This practicum has demonstrated that teachers working together under these conditions promote positive change. It is strongly recommended that:

1. All ninth grade teachers participate in teams to facilitate a smooth transition from more homogeneous grouping in grades seven and eight to totally heterogeneous grouping in grade nine.
2. Classes are balanced so that each teacher has no more than 20% learning disabled and at-risk students in his/her class. If this cannot be accomplished, then the class size should be drastically reduced.

3. Each ninth grade team is allotted a common meeting time.

4. Each team have an appropriate special staff member assigned to it to serve as a catalyst for the team. This person can be a reading specialist or learning disabilities specialist as they are each well versed in strategies which promote learning for these special populations.

Dissemination

Collaborative consultation is a method that promotes gains for all involved. These results, discussion and recommendations were shared with the personnel that took part in the project and were also made available to the school administration, the district supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction and the Chairman of the Committee for Special Education (who will share recommendations with the Superintendent of schools). Plans are being made to implement a Consultant Teacher Resource service at least on a pilot basis for next year. The results of this project will also be made available to policy makers and persons heading divisions of educational issues at state and federal levels. In order for American education to move forward in the twenty first century it is vital that we share responsibility for designing and implementing strategies that promote student success.

References

- Aksamit, D. (1990). Mildly handicapped and at-risk students: The graying of the line. Academic Therapy, 25(3), 277-289.
- Barclay, K. D. (1990). Constructing meaning: An integrated approach to teaching reading. Intervention in School and Clinic, 26(2), 84-91.
- Barth, R. S. (1991, December). 9 Questions we must ask about school restructuring. The Education Digest, 21-24. Condensed from Phi Delta Kappan, 73, 123-128.
- Bauer, E. (1987). Learning style and the learning disabled. Experimentation with ninth graders. The Clearing House, 60(5), 206-208.
- Bauwens, J., Hourcade, J. J., & Friend, M. (1989). Cooperative teaching: A model for general and special education integration. Remedial and Special Education, 10(2), 17-22.
- Billingsley, B. S. & Wildman, T. M. (1990). Facilitating reading comprehension in learning disabled students: Metacognitive goals and instructional strategies. Remedial and Special Education, 11(2), 18-31.
- Brandt, R. (Ed.). (1990). Learning styles & the brain. (Special Issue). Educational Leadership, 48(2).
- Burnette, J. (1987). Adapting instructional materials for mainstreamed students. (Issue Brief 1.) Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, VA. ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children, 23pgs.
- Bush, G. (President). (1991, February 4,). The National Education Goals. A second report to the nation's governors. Washington: D.C.
- Caldwell, J. (1987). Test review. Reading Style Inventory. Journal of Reading, 30(5), 440-444.
- Candler, A. C., & Hildreth, B. L. (1990). Characteristics of language disorders in learning disabled students. Academic Therapy, 25(3), 333-343.
- Cantrell, R., & Cantrell, M. L. (1980). Ecological problem solving: A decision making heuristic for prevention-intervention educational strategies. In Hogg, J. (Ed.) Advances in Mental Handicap Research, Vol. 1. NY:Wiley.

- Clarke, J. H. (1991). Using visual organizers to focus on thinking. Journal of Reading, 34(7), 526-534.
- Cohen, S. B. and deBettencourt, L. V. (1991) Dropout: Intervening with the reluctant learner. Intervention in School and Clinic, 26 (5), 263-271.
- Deshler, D. D., Alley, G. R., & Carlson, S. A. (1980). Learning strategies: An approach to mainstreaming secondary students with learning disabilities. Education Unlimited, 2(4), 6-11.
- Downing, J. A., Moran, M. R., Myles, B. S., & Ormsbee, C. K. (1991). Using reinforcement in the classroom. Intervention in School and Clinic, 27(2), 85-90.
- Evans, C. (1991). Support for teachers studying their own work. Educational Leadership, 48(6), 11-13.
- Ferrell, B. G. (1983). A factor analysis comparison of four learning-styles inventories. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75(1), 33-39.
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (1989). Enhancing curriculum-based management through computer applications: Review of research and practice. School Psychology Review, 18(3), 317-327.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Bahr, M. W. (1990). Mainstream assistance teams: A scientific basis for the art of consultation. Exceptional Children, 57(2), 128-139.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Hamlett, C. L. (1990). Curriculum-based measurement: A standardized, long-term goal approach to monitoring student progress. Academic Therapy, 25(5), 615-632.
- Fulk, B. J. Mushinski and Mastropieri, M. A. (1990). Training positive attitudes: "I tried hard and did well!" Intervention in School and Clinic, 26(2), 79-83.
- Glicking, E. E., Shane, R. L., & Croskery, K. M. (1989). Developing math skills in low-achieving high school students through curriculum-based assessment. School Psychology Review, 18(3), 344-355.
- Gursky, D. (1989, Nov.) What Makes a Good Teacher? Teacher Magazine. 35-36.
- Gwada, K & Griggs, S.A. (1985). The school dropout: Implications for counselors. The School Counselor, 33(1), 9-17.

- Hansell, T. S. (1981). Four methods of diagnosis for content area reading. Journal of Reading, 24(8), 696-700.
- Harris, K. R. and Pressley, M. (1991). The nature of cognition strategy instruction: Interactive strategy construction. Exceptional Children, 57(6), 392-403.
- Hill, Marie Somers. (1991, Fall). Enhancing professional growth through collegial pairs. Florida ASCD Journal, 18-19.
- Horton, S. V., Lovitt, T. C. & Bergerud, D. (1990). The effectiveness of graphic organizers for three classifications of secondary students in content area classes. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 23(1), 12-22.
- Huefner, D. S. (1988). The consulting teacher model: Risks and opportunities. Exceptional Children, 54(5), 403-414.
- Idol, L. (1990). The scientific art of classroom consultation. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 1(1), 3-22.
- Levine, E. Z. (1991). Learning styles and aptitude treatment interactions: From theory to practice. Unpublished manuscript (Child and Youth Studies). Nova University, Ft. Lauderdale, Fl.
- Levine, E. Z. (1991). Considering cooperative learning techniques with learning disabled adolescents in mainstreamed high school classes. Submitted Paper For Publication, (Child and Youth Studies). Nova University, Ft. Lauderdale, Fl.
- Lindsay, Ogden R. (1990). Precision teaching: By teachers for children. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22(3), 10-15.
- Lovett, T. (1990). Translating research. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22(3), 16-19.
- Mamchur, C. (1990). But ... the curriculum. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(8), 634-637.
- Marchant, G. J. (1990). Faculty questionnaires: A useful resource for LD support services. Intervention in School and Clinic, 26(2), 106-109.
- Munro, P. & Elliot, J. (1987). Instructional growth through peer coaching. Journal of Staff Development, 8(1), 25-28.

- Okebukola, P. A. (1986). The influence of preferred learning styles on cooperative learning in science. Science Education, 70(5), 509-517.
- Pennell, L. (1985). Academic intervention program: Applying brain and learning styles concepts. Theory into Practice, 24(2), 131-134.
- Peterson, D. W., & Miller, J. A. (1990). Best practices in peer-influenced learning. Best Practices in School Psychology II. National Association of School Psychologists. Washington, D.C. 531-546.
- Peterson, P. L. (1988). Teachers' and students' cognitional knowledge for classroom teaching and learning. Educational Researcher, 17(5), 5-14.
- Pittelman, S. D., Heimlich, J. E., Berglund, R. L., & French, M. P. (1991). Semantic feature analysis: Classroom applications. (Entire issue). (International Reading Association). Reading Aids Series. Newark, DE.
- Polloway, E. A., & Patton, J. R., (Eds.). (1989). Special issue: Study skills. (Entire issue). Academic Therapy, 24(4).
- Potter, M. L. & Wamre, H. M. (1990). Curriculum-based measurement and developmental reading models: Opportunities for cross-validation. Exceptional Children, 57(1), 16-25.
- Reisberg, L. (1990). Curriculum evaluation and modification: An effective Teaching Perspective. Intervention in School and Clinic, 26(2), 99-105.
- Rockler, M. J. (1987). Time, communication, and ways to facilitate learning styles. The Social Studies, 60(5), 270-272.
- Rogers, V. R. & Stevenson, C. (1988). How do we know what kids are learning in school? Educational Leadership, 45(5), 68-75.
- Schulte, A. C., Osborne, S. S., & McKinney, J. D. (1990). Academic outcomes for students with learning disabilities in consultation and resource programs. Exceptional Children, 57(2), 162-172.
- Seidenberg, P. L. (1988). Cognitive and academic instructional intervention for learning-disabled adolescents. Topics In Language Disorders, 8(3), 56-71.

- Steinberger, E. R. (1989). Cognition and learner control: A literature review, 1977-1988. Journal of Computer Based Instruction, 16(4), 117-121.
- Tama, M. C. & Martinez, D. H. (1988). TELSQA and the mainstreamed LD social studies student. The Social Studies, 78(6), 274-277.
- Tateyama-Sniezek, K. M. (1990). Cooperative learning: Does it improve the academic achievement of students with handicaps? Exceptional Children, 56(5), 426-437.
- Taymans, J. M. (1989). Cooperative learning for learning disabled adolescents. The Pointer, 33(2), 28-32.
- Tindal, G., Shinn, M. R. & Rodden-Nord, K. (1990). Contextually based school consultation: Influential variables. Exceptional Children, 56(4), 324-336.
- Tindal, G. & Parker, R. (1990). Developmental of written retell as a curriculum-based measurement in secondary programs. School Psychology Review, 18(3), 328-343.
- Wade, S. E. & Reynolds, R. E. (1989). Developing metacognitive awareness. Journal of Reading, 33(1), 6-14.
- Wehrung-Schaffner, L. & Sapona, R. H. (1990). May the FORCE be with you: A test preparation strategy for learning disabled adolescents. Academic Therapy, 25(3), 291-300.
- West, J. F. (1990). Educational Collaboration in the restructuring of schools. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 1(1), 23-40.
- West, J. F. & Idol, L. (1990). Collaborative consultation in the education of mildly handicapped and at-risk students. Remedial and Special Education, 11(1), 22-31.
- West, R. P., Young, K. R. & Spooner, F. (1990, Spring). Precision teaching. Teaching Exceptional Children, 4-19.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
LEARNING CHANNEL PREFERENCE CHECKLIST

Appendix A

NAME: _____

DATE: _____

Learning Channel Preference Checklist

Read each sentence carefully and think about how it applies to you. On each line, write the number that best describes your reaction to each sentence.

5-ALMOST ALWAYS 4-OFTEN 3-SOMETIMES 2-RARELY 1-ALMOST NEVER

- _____ 1. I can remember something better if I write it down.
- _____ 2. When reading, I listen to the words in my head or I read aloud.
- _____ 3. I need to discuss things to understand them better.
- _____ 4. I don't like to read or listen to directions; I'd rather just start doing.
- _____ 5. I am able to visualize pictures in my head.
- _____ 6. I can study better when music is playing.
- _____ 7. I need frequent breaks while studying.
- _____ 8. I think better when I have the freedom to move around; studying at a desk is not for me.
- _____ 9. I take lots of notes on what I read and hear.
- _____ 10. It helps me to LOOK at a person speaking. It keeps me focused.
- _____ 11. It's hard for me to understand what a person is saying when there is background noise.
- _____ 12. I prefer having someone tell me how to do something rather than having to read the directions myself.
- _____ 13. I prefer hearing a lecture or tape rather than reading a textbook.
- _____ 14. When I can't think of a specific word, I use my hands a lot and call something a "what-cha-ma-call-it" or a "thing-a-ma-jig."
- _____ 15. I can easily follow a speaker even though my head is down or I'm staring out the window.
- _____ 16. It's easier for me to get work done in a quiet place.
- _____ 17. It's easy for me to understand maps, charts and graphs.
- _____ 18. When beginning an article or book, I prefer to take a peek at the ending.
- _____ 19. I remember what people say better than what they look like.
- _____ 20. I remember things better if I study aloud with someone.
- _____ 21. I take notes, but never go back and read them.
- _____ 22. When I am concentrating on reading or writing, the radio bothers me.
- _____ 23. It's hard for me to picture things in my head.
- _____ 24. I find it helpful to talk myself through my homework assignments.
- _____ 25. My notebook and desk may look messy, but I know where things are.
- _____ 26. When taking a test, I can "see" the textbook page and the correct answer on it.
- _____ 27. I cannot remember a joke long enough to tell it later.
- _____ 28. When learning something new, I prefer to listen to information on it, then read about it, then do it.
- _____ 29. I like to complete one task before starting another.
- _____ 30. I use my fingers to count and I move my lips when I read.
- _____ 31. I dislike proofreading my work.
- _____ 32. When I am trying to remember something new, for example, a telephone number, it helps me to form a picture of it in my head.
- _____ 33. For extra credit, I prefer to do a report on tape rather than write it.
- _____ 34. I daydream in class.
- _____ 35. For extra credit, I'd rather create a project than write a report.
- _____ 36. When I get a great idea, I must write it down right away or I'll forget it.

© Lynn O'Brien, 1990 All Rights Reserved

Specific Diagnostic Studies, 11600 Nebel St., Suite 130, Rockville, MD 20852

With Permission From: Lynn O'Brien, Specific Diagnostic
Studies, 11600 Nebel Street, Rockville, MD 20852

APPENDIX B
SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

Appendix B Survey of Instructional Methods

Please indicate:

	3-5	2-3	0-1	
	(times per week)			
1. How often you:				
use a textbook	----	----	----	
use lecture method	----	----	----	
have class discussions	----	----	----	
watch videos or films	----	----	----	
2. What percent of your time is spent:	75%	50%	25%	0
lecturing	----	----	----	--
discussing	----	----	----	--
questioning	----	----	----	--
testing	----	----	----	--
other -----				
3. What percent of your tests are:	75%	50%	25%	0
Recall (essay or short ans.)	----	----	----	--
Recognition (true-false,	----	----	----	--
multiple choice, matching)	----	----	----	--
Application (essay or short	----	----	----	--
answer requiring some evaluation	----	----	----	--
or synthesis of materials)	----	----	----	--
4. How many vidoes or films do you show each marking period?				
other media? -----				
5. Which of these are regulary available to students?				
(Check all those that apply)				
handouts	study guides	review sheets		
other materials? -----				
6. How many do you require each marking period?				
----homeworks	---- projects or reports			
----tests	---- worksheets			
----quizzes	---- extra credit oportunities			
other requirements? -----				
Please add any other information about your requirements or preferred methods on the back.				

 Idea was adapted from: Marchant, Gregory M. Faculty
 Questionnaires: A Useful Resource for LD Support Services.
Intervention in School and Clinic, 26(2), p. 109.

APPENDIX C
ATTITUDE TOWARDS CLASSROOM ADAPTIONS SURVEY

Appendix C

Attitude Towards Classroom Adaptions Survey

Please circle if you agree or disagree with these statements:

1. A learning disabled student may have any test read to him/her if needed. Yes No
2. Students with learning disabilities may have as much time as needed for tests. Yes No
3. A learning disabled student, with difficulties writing, may respond orally to tests. Yes No
4. A learning disabled student, with difficulties writing, may record his/her answers with another teacher or on a tape recorder or computer. Yes No
5. A learning disabled student may record my class lectures. Yes No
6. I would allow a learning disabled student copies of class notes from:

another student	Yes	No
my lecture notes	Yes	No
photocopies of overheads	Yes	No
7. I will accept alternative forms of projects, such as taped or oral reports, instead of written ones. Yes No
8. I am available for extra help.

Once a week	three times a week	daily
-------------	--------------------	-------
9. I believe in giving review sessions before exams. Yes No
10. Progress reports are given periodically to:

student	Yes	No
parent	Yes	No
resource room teacher	Yes	No
others	Yes	No

This is from an idea presented in: Marchant, Gregory M.
 Faculty Questionnaires: A Useful Resource for LD Support
 Services. Intervention in School and Clinic, 26(2), p. 109.

APPENDIX D
INFORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM

Appendix D
Informal Classroom Observation Form

Teacher's Name: _____
Subject Area Class: _____

Period: _____ Grade: ____
Date: _____

I. Overview of lesson/activities

II. Knowledge of content and curriculum

III. Learning experiences for students

IV. Guided and independent practice

V. Management of student behavior

VI. Monitor and evaluate student outcomes

Much appreciation for the idea for this format which was
based on: Peer Evaluation Project described by Marlene
Henriques during Nova University's Summer Institute,
Specialization Instruction, University of Maryland, July,
1991.

APPENDIX E

CBA FOR READING COMPREHENSION AND VOCABULARY
EVALUATION IN GRADE 9 SOCIAL STUDIES

Appendix E
Sample CBA for Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary
Evaluation in Grade 9.

EUROPEAN BOUNDARIES ALSO SPLIT MANY TRIBES (CHAPT.14)

Read p. 164 to p. 166. Answer the following questions
based on that reading.

1. Name one present political problem caused by colonialism.
2. Define the word boundaries - (p. 164).
3. Define the word hostilities - (p. 164).
4. Define the word nationalist - (p. 166).
5. Discuss one possible solution to tribal hostility based on your understanding of this reading and your study of Africa.

CBA is based on an assigned reading of the student text, Newhill, E.E. and la Paglia, U. (Eds.). (1986). Exploring World Cultures, Lexington, MA: Ginn and Company.

APPENDIX F
GRAPHIC ORGANIZERS AND OTHER STRATEGIES

Appendix F

Graphic Organizers and Other Strategies

Graphic Organizers:

There are many ways that notetaking can be enhanced, one is through an organized map or outline of what will be talked about in the lecture, or seen in the film. Students can be given a variety of organizers, from simple completions to maps, webs, and a variety of other formats, some looking like flow charts or organizational plans.

Keywords:

Useful for speeches as well as summarizing, the art of finding keywords is a very necessary one for students. With the help of instruction by the teacher, keywords can be practiced in a variety of ways and in conjunction with many of the other skills and strategies that will be taught. One of my favorite uses for keywords is to write them in the margin of the notebook when studying. Thus each page of notes also has KEYWORDS to the left of the page. Underlining and highlighting can also be used.

Math Estimation:

Many times math teachers forget to have students estimate their answers and verbalize the process they used. These simple techniques increase math cognition and enhance the learning process in general. Students trained to use estimation have the advantage of knowing if their answers make sense after the problem is solved.

Mnemonics:

One device which works for many forms of memorizing tasks is to use the first letter of each word in the list being memorized. For example, the Great Lakes are HOMES; this mnemonic represents the first letter of the name of each of them.

APPENDIX G
INTERVIEWS FOR FINAL EVALUATIONS

Appendix G

Interviews For Final Evaluation

The interviews will supplement the journal or log being kept by each participant.

Student Interview:

The student will be interviewed by the resource consultant teacher to see if the student understood the skill being practiced and the strategy taught. The questions will be opened ended, such as:

1. Do you remember something your teacher did differently during the term since the beginning of the year?
*Specifically question with regard to English, social studies and science.
2. Is there one special strategy you like? ie. notetaking, reading comprehension quizzes, open book tests, learning in pairs, making a textbook glossary, etc.
3. What is it? (for science, for English, for social studies?)
4. Why do you do it?
5. What did you like about learning special skills from Mr. (E) _____ Mr. (M) _____ or Ms. (G) or (M)
6. What didn't you like about learning special skills?
7. Would you like to have more instruction in strategies, perhaps to help you pass tests? Which ones? Why?

Teacher Interview

The practicum teacher will conduct informal interviews to see if the teacher feels that students are performing better than they would have without specific strategy intervention.

1. Suggestions for continued work in this area, or discontinuance will be noted.
2. What did you like? Dislike?
3. What might you change?
4. Would you continue to use these strategies?
5. How might the project be changed?
6. Other comments.

APPENDIX H

FINAL STUDENT INTERVIEW: PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM PROCEEDURE

APPENDIX H

FINAL STUDENT INTERVIEW: PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM PROCEDURES

1. Did you notice anything different in the way some classes were taught since the beginning of the year?

English - Teacher 1's students all noticed cooperative learning and oral reading were added.

English - Teacher 2's students did not notice anything different, but were aware of the reading comprehensions and advanced organizers when I mentioned them.

Social Studies - Teacher's students all noted that the notegiving stopped, and the dittos were added.

Science - Teacher's students all commented that he no longer puts notes on the board for the whole period, and that he gives advanced organizers and dittos more.

2. If yes, what did you think of the change?

English - Teacher 1's students liked working in pairs.

"you get more ideas because others are helping you, two heads are better than one, oral reading is better because when I have to read by myself, I get distracted, when we read out loud I follow along and keep my place."

English - Teacher 2's students found the use of organizers a very big asset in understanding the reading and being able to write essays comparing books.

Social Studies - Teacher's students appreciate the dittos that help them make the textbook easier (creating the glossary) and they liked the dittos and understand the text better because of the reading comprehensions (CBAs).

Science - Teacher's students disagreed, one said, "he used to give us notes, now we have to take them ourselves, that's too hard, my notes get all screwed up" and another said the opposite, "his teaching has been better, he keeps you interested in what he says and does instead of just writing notes all the time."

3. What would you need to pass or do well in your classes?

English - need to keep good notebook and study from it.

Social Studies - need to get help to study, this is a very hard subject with a lot to memorize.

Science - need help taking notes, but he gives good help.

APPENDIX I

FINAL INTERVIEW: CLASSROOM TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROJECT

APPENDIX I

FINAL INTERVIEW: CLASSROOM TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROJECT

1. Now that we have worked on collaborative consultation for twelve weeks, how might you sum up the project?

All felt it was most worthwhile and should continue in some way. In their words, the teachers said:

"It definitely helped. The discussion of strategies and learning styles was helpful and it was extremely valuable to share with other teachers. It was especially helpful for me to know more about the students so I could avoid unnecessary confrontations. Sometimes a mountain is made out of a molehill!"

"This broke down barriers between people; the resource room specialist and the classroom teacher, teacher to teacher barriers and also teacher to chairperson. We found out that we're all going to the same finish line but in different ways! It's especially good for the kids to know that we are sharing information. They (the kids) try to play one (teacher) against the other."

"Discussions of teaching techniques were valuable to me personally in that it made me more aware of doing things like graphic organizers that were visual for the kids, I mean something they could remember because of how it looked, not just what it said. I loved those reading passages, (CBAs), I intend to emulate that!"

"Unfortunately the project took a lot of time. You're fortunate that you're a highly respected person in this building because that is why we teachers have freely given our time."

"It was of great help to me personally, but I don't know how we'll find time for it (to continue). I mean you did so much work! I love the materials you gave me, I don't have the time to do them myself. After so many years of teaching it's good to realize that you are not the only person having trouble with these kids."

"I think I got the most out of the project because I'm so new to teaching, but it was really great for me to see that the experienced teachers are having the same problems I am, at least I know I'm not the only one."

2. Will you continue using the strategies we designed?

All said yes, hopefully with your help! (I have assured

each one that I am still available and that I hope they will find time to continue to work with one another, with the other resource room teachers, as well as with me.)

3. What suggestions do you have?

"Assuming this (project in collaborative consultation) was to continue, we need two things, more time and somebody there who can let me know what buttons to push (on the kids)! It's been great seeking out more input and finding out if what I am giving them (the kids) is appropriate."

"We need to be able to have peers like you in our classes to give us feedback. (Refers to peer observation by the practicum teacher.) It also helps to have the resource room more in touch with the curriculum."

"This idea of teams (collaborations among many teachers sharing the same group of students) should be extended into the ninth grade, (like this project did), this is a troublesome time for kids."

"I believe there should be this type of collaborative consultation on each of the resource room kids. The sharing of information and exchange of ideas should definately be continued."

In summary the teachers all echoed the author's perception that when responsibility is shared and collaboration is effective everyone benefits.